

REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 10, 2004 (Paper No. 34). Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 to 46 and 62 to 67 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 9 and 12 are the independent claims. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 25, 31 and 62 to 67 are being amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10 and 13 are objected to based on formal grounds. It is believed that the amendments made herein obviate the objection.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication in the Office Action that Claims 64 and 66 contain allowable subject matter. In this regard, the Examiner confirmed to Applicants' undersigned attorney by telephone that the inclusion of these claims in the listing of rejected claims in the Office Action Summary was in error. Further in this regard, since similar features are recited in the claim, it is believed that Claim 62 is also allowable.

By the Office Action, Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,243,724 (Mander) and U.S. Patent 5,923,845 (Kamiya), and Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15 to 46, 62, 63, 65 and 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mander, Kamiya and U.S. Patent 5,832,470 (Morita).

The claim rejections are traversed, since they are believed to be legally insufficient. More particularly, as pointed out in MPEP 2141.02 et seq., the claimed invention must be considered as a whole, and in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, it is necessary to show each and every feature in the combination claimed.

Accordingly, the claim rejections are not seen to establish a prima facie case, and are therefore believed to be insufficient.

According to the present invention, at least one candidate folder suitable for storing a new document is identified from a plurality of folders, a user is notified of the candidate folder(s) identified, and the new document is stored in a candidate folder selected by the user from among the candidate folder(s) noticed to the user.

Advantageously and by virtue of the above arrangement, saving a document by a user is facilitated, since the user need only select from folders identified as having documents similar to the document to be saved.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 is directed to a document processing system comprising a folder retaining means, new document retaining means, candidate folder identifying means, notifying means and storing means. The folder retaining means retains a plurality of folders, each of the folders storing at least one document, and the new document retaining means retains a new document. The candidate folder identifying means identifies at least one candidate folder from the plurality of folders suitable for storing the new document, the at least one candidate folder having documents more similar to the new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders. The notifying means notifies a user of the at least one candidate folder identified by the candidate folder identifying means, and the storing means stores the new document into a selected folder selected by the user from the plurality of folders notified by the notifying means.

It is conceded in the Office Action that Mander fails to teach the retaining

means for retaining a new document, the notifying means for notifying a user of the candidate folder(s) selected by said candidate folder selecting means, and storing means for storing the new document into a selected folder selected by the user from the plurality of folders.

Mander is seen to describe a graphical user interface, in which documents are depicted in stacks. A user is able to create a new stack, or to create a “sub-stack” of another stack. (See Mander, Abstract, col. 7, lines 23 to 51, col. 8, lines 31 to 46 and col. 9, lines 1 to 50.) Although Mander describes a system in which documents may be automatically filed away in a similar stack, the document is automatically stored without notification to the user, and selection by the user of the folder into which the user wishes the document to be saved.

In other words, Mander is not seen to disclose the features of: i) identifying at least one candidate folder from among a plurality of folders, the at least one candidate folder identified having documents more similar to a new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders, ii) notifying the user of the at least one candidate folder identified as having documents more similar to a new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders, and iii) storing the new document in a candidate folder noticed to the user as having documents more similar to a new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders, which was selected by the user.

Kamiya is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Mander. More particularly, Kamiya is seen to describe a system for receiving email in different in-boxes, referred to in Kamiya as collectors, each of which has its own address. Thus, using

different address designations, email can be sent to different collectors. Once a document is posted to the collector, a notifier notifies the user that the document has been posted to the collector, so that the user can view the posted document.

It is stated in the Office Action, at page 14, that col. 9, line 28 to col. 10, line 50 of Kamiya is seen to disclose the above-identified features of the invention. However, the cited portion of Kamiya is seen describe a linking feature that allows multiple collectors to be linked such that information is automatically transferred between collectors, or information in one collector is accessible from another. The cited portion of Kamiya is seen to describe notifying a user when information is received from a linked collector.

Kamiya, and in particular the portion of Kamiya cited by the Office Action, is not seen to disclose the features of: i) identifying at least one candidate folder from among a plurality of folders, the at least one candidate folder identified having documents more similar to a new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders, ii) notifying the user of the at least one candidate folder identified as having documents more similar to a new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders, and iii) storing the new document in a candidate folder noticed to the user as having documents more similar to a new document than documents in other of the plurality of folders, which was selected by the user.

Therefore, since neither Mander and Kamiya taken alone, or when taken in combination, if such a combination is even permissible, is not seen to teach the features of the claim as a whole, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further,

Applicants submit that Claims 9 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining pending claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200